



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,161	02/19/2004	David Bryant	DC-05585	5008
33438	7590	05/19/2005	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP			HYEON, HAE M	
P.O. BOX 203518			ART UNIT	
AUSTIN, TX 78720			PAPER NUMBER	

2839

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/782,161

Applicant(s)

BRYANT, DAVID

Examiner

Hae M. Hyeon

Art Unit

2839



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/20/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on March 31, 2005. These drawings are approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 4, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikeya (5,688,128).

Ikeya discloses system comprising a motherboard 70, a socket frame 10, a socket 42, a processor 60, a load plate 12 and a processor extraction device in form of an adhesive and a plurality of springs 44. Although Ikeya does not disclose plural components for processing information, it is inherent that the system of Ikeya has plural components because an electronic device with a motherboard has plural components for processing information. The socket frame 10 is coupled to the motherboard 70. The socket 42 is disposed within the socket frame 10. The socket has plural connectors 50 in electrical communication with the motherboard 70. The load plate 12 is coupled to the socket frame 10 and has a closed position and an opened position over the processor 60. Column 4, lines 25-32 state that the processor 60 is held in carrier 62 by an adhesive. Therefore, the adhesive is disposed in between the load plate 12 and the processor 60 since the carrier 62 is in between the load plate 12 and the processor 60. When the load plate 12

is in the open position, the processor 60 is extracted. Also, the springs 44 are disposed between the processor 60 and the motherboard 70 to provide a uniform extraction forces to the processor 60 and bias the processor 60 out of the socket 42.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4 and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McHugh et al (6,758,691 B1) in view of Ikeya (5,688,128).

McHugh discloses system 1 comprising a socket frame 10, a land grid array socket 11, a processor 2, and a load plate 14. Although McHugh does not disclose plural components for processing information, it is inherent that the system of McHugh has plural components because an electronic device with a motherboard has plural components for processing information. Furthermore, the examiner will not explain the functions of each element since the system of McHugh is the same type of system as the instant invention. The only thing that McHugh does not disclose is processor extraction device comprising an adhesive disposed between the load plate and the processor or a spring disposed between the processor and the motherboard.

Ikeya discloses a system comprising a socket frame 10, a socket 42, a processor 60, a load plate 14, and a processor extraction device in form of an adhesive or a spring 44. Since, the

examiner has already explained the structure of Ikeya's system, the examiner will omit the description of Ikeya's system (see 35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejection in the above paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add the processor extraction device in form of an adhesive or a spring as taught by Ikeya in the system taught by McHugh in order to provide an assistance to a processor extracting process from a socket of the system.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed March 31, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the reference by Ikeya discloses that the carrier and processor are extracted with a tool such as a pair of tweezers.

The examiner agrees with the applicant that the carrier and processor are extracted with a tool such as a pair of tweezers. However, the reference by Ikeya reads on the claim limitations. The independent claims recite that the processor extraction device disposed approximate the load plate and **operable (automatically in claim 14) to extract the processor from the socket** upon movement of the load plate from a closed to an open position. It is correct that a pair of tweezers is used to extract the carrier 62 and the processor 60. However, the processor 60 is not directly engaged by the pair of tweezers. Only the load plate 62 is directly engaged by the pair of tweezers. Ikeya teaches that the pair of tweezers is used to extract the load plate 62 while the processor 60 is attached to the load plate 62 by an adhesive. Therefore, the processor 60 is automatically extracted from a socket 42 **when the load plate 60 is operated by the pair of tweezers**. While the instant invention uses the lever 14 as an operating means for the load plate

12, the reference by Ikeya uses the pair of tweezers as an operating means for the load plate 62. The claims recite that the processor extraction device is an adhesive disposed between the load plate and the processor and not the load plate's operating means. Ikeya clearly discloses that the processor 60 attached to the load plate 62 by an adhesive (see column 6, lines 63-67 and column 7, lines 1-3). Thus, the reference by Ikeya clearly reads on all the limitations of the claims and the rejections made in the previous office action filed on January 10, 2005 are appropriate.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hae M. Hyeon whose telephone number is 571-272-2093. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. (8:30-5:30).

Art Unit: 2839

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tulsidas C. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hae M Hyeon
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2839

hnh

hnh

Hae Moon Hyeon